USAID Recommendations on the Revised CRSP Portfolio

Offices of Agriculture & Natural Resources

Management

SPARE Meeting
January 19th 2006



ME Competitions & Incorporation of Lessons Learned from Recent Competitions

9:00 to 10:00



Key Issues...

- 1. How many CRSPs should be competed in FY '06?
- 2. What extensions should be made to current CRSPs?
- 3. What level of "substantial involvement" should be included in future agreements?
- 4. What is an appropriate composition of the Technical Evaluation Committees (TEC), which will evaluate proposals?



CRSP Competitions for FY '06

- 1. Agency capacity for multiple competitions in a single year
- 2. Impact of delaying some competitions back to FY '07
- 3. Costs & benefits of delaying competition if subject area is already determined



Recommendation

Compete four CRSP MEs in FY '06

- Peanut
- Sorghum, Millet & Other Grains
- Aquaculture & Fisheries
- Assets & Market Access



Extensions to Current CRSPs

- 1. Purpose of extensions
 - Maintain critical research
 - Synthesize lessons learned
 - Prepare documents and data for transfer to potential new ME
- 2. Length of extensions



Recommendations

- 1. USAID will request that current MEs provide a proposal for the transition period identifying:
 - Critical research to be maintained
 - Process for synthesizing lessons learned from research
 - Tasks required to provide smooth transfer of documents and data to new ME
- 2. Extensions will overlap up to 6 months following the award of the new CRSP
 - N.B. Final decisions on extensions will be determined by the Office of Acquisition & Assistance following review of technical office recommendations



'Substantial Involvement'

- 1. Lessons learned from SANREM & IPM
- 2. Participation/involvement in existing CRSPs
- 3. Strengthening communication and collaboration



What is Substantial Involvement?

- 1. Description of anticipated Agency involvement
- 2. Intent to assist ME in achieving supported objectives
- 3. Wide range of potential participation / involvement tailored to specific agreement



Recommendation – limit substantial involvement to:

- Approval of implementation plans for the Leader Award
- 2. Approval of key personnel (CRSP Director)
- 3. Agency and ME joint participation
 - Collaborative involvement in selection of advisory committee members and USAID participation as member of committees
 - USAID participation with voice and vote but no veto in selection of sub-award recipients
 - Concurrence on the monitoring and evaluation plan



Composition of Technical Evaluation Committees

- 1. USAID's desire to include external experts in Proposal Review
- 2. Logistics involved in external expert participation
- 3. Avoidance of Conflict of Interest



Recommendation

- 1. USAID will strive to have committees of four or more members
- 2. At least one of the members should be an external technical expert
- 3. USAID will look to the US University Community, other US Agencies, the private sector, and donor organizations for relevant experts



New CRSP Portfolio, Core Program Components, & Focal Points

10:00 to noon



Revised CRSP Portfolio

- Public feedback on research content of individual CRSPs
- Discussions with BIFAD



Recommended Portfolio

- 1. Sorghum, Millet & Other Grains (2006)
- 2. Peanut (2006)
- 3. Aquaculture & Fisheries (2006)
- 4. Assets & Market Access (2006)
- 5. Dry Grain Pulses (2007)
- 6. Horticulture (2007)
- 7. Livestock & Poultry (2008)

2008 - Evaluation of SANREM & IPM CRSPs & Revisit recommendation for Soil, Water & Ecosystem Services CRSP



Core Program Components

- 1. Consistency with USAID's strategic direction
- 2. Coherent approach across the portfolio
- 3. Appropriateness of components (alternative suggestions included: reciprocal US Benefits, Impact Assessment)
- 4. Scope and expectations of the intellectual leadership component



Recommended Components

- 1. Systems Approach
- 2. Social, Economic & Environmental Sustainability
- 3. Capacity Building & Institutional Strengthening
- 4. Outreach, Dissemination & Adoption
- 5. Intellectual Leadership



Intellectual Leadership

Each CRSP is to take intellectual leadership by:

- 1) Consolidating findings across their research activities according to themes that emerge from those activities
- 2) Identifying topics that fit logically as sub-themes of USAID's broader 'Focal Points'
- 3) Identifying at least one sub-theme for which they will take leadership on key learnings from CRSPs and other relevant research



Focal Points

- Clarity of name ('focal points' or 'broad impact areas')
- 2. Determination of Focal Points for individual CRSPs
- 3. Alternative suggestions (poverty eradication, gender equity & women's empowerment; health & nutrition; ag. sustainability; development partnerships & trade; economic growth; US benefits; region specific focal points)



Recommendations

- 1. Rename these 'Focal Areas for Development Results'
- 2. Current Focal Areas will be retained given their relevance to USAID's strategic direction
- 3. Long-term research will drive Focal Area sub-themes
- 4. Focal Area leadership will be determined through a consultative process between the ME, other CRSPs and USAID

